REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are requested. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 10 and 15 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-11, 14-16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0049815 (Dattatri). In numbered paragraph 20, page 7 of the Office Action, claims 12, 13, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Dattatri document in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,924,096 (Draper et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Dattatri publication and the and the Draper et al. patent, considered individually or in the combination relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' present invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 10 and 15. For example, the documents relied upon by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest automated polling in a network wherein a server receives a request for data generated by a client using an http message, the data being transmitted in XML format to the client, and the client synchronizing its maintenance of data with the database on the server. As such, claim 1 is allowable. Independent claims 10 and 15 are allowable for similar reasons.

Referring to Applicants' Figure 1 flowchart, an exemplary method for providing automated event polling is illustrated. The automated event polling includes the logging of data into a database on a server at step 10. Event data associated with the server can be logged for retrieval by a client application as described on specification page 3 in paragraph [0010]. In step 12 of Figure 1, a request by the

client is received at the server for the data using an http message, and in step 14, a

response is provided by reformatting the requested data into an XML format which

can be transmitted to the client in step 16 (e.g., paragraph [0010]). Figure 2

illustrates an alternate exemplary method for automated event polling in a network

on a client platform wherein an http request for data is generated, and a response is

received from a database in an XML format. The data received in an XML format is

then converted to a format used by client software. Automated event polling is

performed using http requests. The client can synchronize with the server in

maintaining its data (e.g., paragraph [0016]. Referring to Applicants' Figure 3

embodiment, a computer-based server 300 includes logic that receives an http

request (e.g., web server 308) for data from a database of data storage 304. Logic,

such as data interface 306 responds to the request by reformatting the data into an

XML format so that the data can be transmitted in an XML format. A client 310

generates the http request via a client interface 312, and receives responsive data

transmitted from the server 300 in an XML format (e.g., paragraph [0014]).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by the independent claims

1, 10 and 15, and are neither taught nor suggested by the Dattatri publication,

considered alone or in combination with the Draper et al. patent. The Dattatri

publication does not teach or suggest automated polling in a network wherein a

server receives a request for data generated by a client using an http message, the

data being transmitted in XML format to the client, and the client synchronizing its

maintenance of data with the database on the server.

In paragraph 28, page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts "Nowhere

in independent claims 1, 10 or 15 is there any mention of reformatting the data into

XML before sending the request to the database. Nor is there any mention of supplying the request to the database." These assertion are traversed in light of the presently amended claims. For example, claim 1 recites responding to the request received by the server by reformatting the data in the database.

The Dattatri publication discloses at paragraph [0012] servlets communicating across http with XML. The disclosed servlets do not relate to the claimed synchronizing of the client's maintenance of data with a database on a server. Rather, the Dattatri document is directed to a user accessing data via an http request which is initiated by the user, resulting in asynchronous, non-direct, access to a database with no suggestion of synchronizing the maintenance of client data with a server database. At least for the foregoing reasons, the Dattatri publication does not teach or suggest automated polling in a network wherein a server receives a request for data generated by a client using an http message, the data being transmitted in XML format to the client, and the client synchronizing its maintenance of data with the database on the server. Because similar features are recited in independent claims 10 and 15, independent claims 1, 10 and 15 are allowable over the Dattatri publication.

The Draper patent fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Dattatri publication. The Draper patent is directed to a distributed, active database, as opposed to a static database which can be accessed directly by http requests. The Draper patent is not directed to automated polling in a network wherein a server receives a request for data generated by a client using an http message, the data being transmitted in XML format to the client, and the client synchronizing its maintenance of data with the database on the server. As such, even if there would

have been motivation or suggestion to combine the Dattatri and Draper documents in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the presently claimed invention would not have resulted. Moreover, because the Draper patent is not even directed to the use of http requests, it is respectfully submitted that there would have been no motivation or suggestion to have combined the features of the Dattatri and Draper patents to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

Thus, independent claims 1, 10 and 15 are allowable over the Dattatri publication and the Draper patent. The remaining claims depend from the aforementioned independent claims and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, these claims are also considered allowable.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 6, 2005   By: _____

Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620